

**8.16        Paleontological Resources**

The Henrietta Peaker Project (HPP) consists of a 91.4-megawatt (MW) (net), natural-gas-fired, simple-cycle power plant located approximately 10 miles southwest of Lemoore, California, on a seven-acre portion of a 20-acre parcel owned by GWF Energy LLC. The HPP will interconnect to the existing adjacent Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) Henrietta Substation through a new 550-foot 70-kilovolt (kV) transmission line supported on two new transmission poles. Other linear facilities include an approximately 16.5-foot water interconnection pipeline (from the site property boundary) and a 2.2-mile Southern California Gas Company natural gas interconnection pipeline. Additionally, approximately five acres will be used for temporary construction laydown and parking.

Paleontological resources are the mineralized (fossilized) remains of prehistoric plant and animal organisms, as well as the mineralized impressions (trace fossils) left as indirect evidence of the form and activity of such organisms. These resources are considered to be nonrenewable resources significant to our culture under state and federal law.

In compliance with California Energy Commission (CEC) Guidelines (CEC, 1992) and *Rules of Practice and Procedure & Power Plant Site Certification Regulations* (CEC, 1997), the paleontological analysis provided herein assesses whether significant paleontological resources exist in areas that could be adversely affected by the HPP. Measures are proposed to mitigate potential adverse effects of the HPP to any significant resources that may be present.

Laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) pertinent to the identification, assessment of significance, and assessment and mitigation of adverse effects to paleontological resources are identified in Section 8.16.4 and Table 8.16-4.

This paleontological analysis also complies with guidelines and significance criteria issued in 1994 by the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology, a national professional organization. These criteria outline acceptable practices in the conduct of paleontological resource surveys, data recovery, analysis, and curation. Mr. David Lawler, a qualified paleontologist, carried out the paleontological resources assessment for the HPP site.

This section summarizes the technical report, which is presented as Appendix L (Lawler, 2001). The technical report, which contains sensitive resource location information, has been filed under separate cover with the CEC under a request for confidentiality.

In 1978, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management proposed the following guidelines to determine the significance of a paleontological resource. A significant paleontological resource is one that:

- Provides important information on evolutionary trends, relating living organisms to extinct organisms;
- Provides important information pertaining to biological community development and zoological/botanical biota interaction;
- Demonstrates unusual circumstances in biotic history; or
- Is of limited sample size, in danger of depletion or destruction by natural processes, vandalism, or commercial exploitation, or is found in no other geographic location.

In addition, all vertebrate fossils are categorized as being of significant scientific value, in keeping with the significance criteria of the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology (1994). Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, a significant effect on paleontological resources can occur when a proposed HPP will “directly or indirectly destroy ...a unique paleontological resource.”

Paleontological resources are classified as a nonrenewable scientific-cultural resource and are protected most notably by the 1906 Federal Antiquities Act and other subsequent federal legislation and policies and CEQA environmental provisions. Significant paleontological resources are defined in this report to include the interpretation outlined by the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology (1994), wherein vertebrate fossils are considered significant.

### **8.16.1 Affected Environment**

#### **8.16.1.1 Overview**

The southern San Joaquin Valley region contains a diverse record of geologic and biologic history that spans more than 30 million years, dating from the Miocene period. Fossils

of marine and terrestrial organisms have accumulated to produce a significant record of prehistoric life, based on the Tertiary- and Quaternary-age deposition of sedimentary sequences. Regional tectonic events ranging from creation of the Tertiary age marine basins to uplift of the southern Sierra Nevada foothill region, as well as fluctuating worldwide sea level changes, have significantly affected the geologic setting of the region.

Much of the paleontological interest in the HPP vicinity stems from the well known discoveries of Pleistocene-age fossil vertebrate faunas derived from undifferentiated Quaternary-age units in other parts of northern and southern California, particularly the San Francisco Bay Region. Scientific description of diverse fossil vertebrate assemblages provides one of the best-known records of Pleistocene faunas in California (see Miller, 1971; Stirton, 1939, 1951; Savage, 1951; Wolf, 1971, 1973, 1975; and Jefferson, 1991). Abundant continental and lacustrine (freshwater) deposits have provided favorable conditions for preserving vertebrate fossil remains in these geologic units.

### **8.16.1.2 Paleontological Literature and Locality Records Review**

Data for the following descriptions of paleontological resources within the HPP area were obtained from published records of previous geologic and paleontological investigations, unpublished paleontological research papers, museum records, and interviews conducted with individuals who have first-hand knowledge of resources within the HPP vicinity. No other projects with a designated paleontological component are known to have conducted previous field or literature surveys or produced sensitivity maps or reports for areas within or adjacent to the HPP.

Sources consulted on the general geology of the area included regional geologic maps compiled by the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). More specific geologic information was obtained from 1:24,000- to 1:250,000-scale USGS and CDMG maps.

Fossil locality records were reviewed and fossil specimens inspected (when possible) at the University of California Museum of Paleontology, which provided most of the data concerning distribution of known fossil resources. Data collected in May and June, 2001

were reviewed to assess the potential for each geologic unit to contain significant paleontological resources and to determine appropriate field survey coverage.

### 8.16.1.3 Overview of Lithologic Units

Surficial sedimentary units of predominantly Pleistocene and Holocene to Recent age underlie the entire HPP area. These sediments include deposition that ranges from continental alluvial, fluvial, lacustrine, fan-derived sediments to subaerial floodplain deposits. Lithologies include sand, gravel, silt, and clay, all of which can be favorable to the preservation of paleontological resources.

Rock outcrops of Pleistocene age occur as surficial and subsurface deposits along the east side of the San Joaquin Valley area. These sedimentary units have been described and mapped previously by Bartow (1991), CDMG (1966), Croft (1967, 1968), and Marchand and Allwardt (1981).

In addition, Bartow (1991) described the geomorphic development of a series of Pleistocene lake deposits, known as the Corcoran and Tulare Lakes, which were subsequently buried by the major westward-flowing alluvial fan sediment drainage. The lateral extent of these Quaternary alluvial (*Qal*) subunits have been extrapolated from unpublished geological subsurface mapping data on the HPP area. The Quaternary rock units vary in facies type from sandstone to unconsolidated siltstone and clays, all of which are either fossiliferous or potentially fossiliferous.

Gradual, long-term erosion and previous construction activity have removed parts of the recent soil cover, so that these Quaternary rock units and their contained fossils are now at or near the surface throughout most of the HPP area. However, these formations or parts of the formations are obscured in most areas by soil, vegetation, or thin deposits of surficial sediment. Thus, visual detection of fossils is possible in those areas where natural erosion or man-made excavations (during road, pipeline, or building site excavation or grading operations) have removed this cover.

Portions of the HPP area appear overlain by shallow, imported fill material. Given this fact, the potential paleontological sensitivity of undisturbed portions of the HPP site

has been determined from the distribution of known vertebrate fossil localities in the region, and available geological mapping of the Quaternary alluvium (*Qal*) and/or Quaternary undifferentiated (*Qu*) outcrops (Croft, 1968).

### **Cenozoic Rock Units**

*Quaternary Alluvium Deposits (Qal/Qu).* While Quaternary alluvium deposits of Pleistocene age occur locally within the HPP area, usage of the *Qal/Qu* designation on available geologic maps of the HPP region is highly variable. Geologic units ranging from Quaternary-age stream, terrace, fluvial, and alluvial fan and floodplain deposits may be grouped under this designation, particularly where geologic data have been scarce due to industrial or agricultural development.

These units outcrop extensively in the HPP–southern San Joaquin Valley region. Bartow (1991) and Croft (1967, 1968, 1969) note that these geological units may exceed several hundred feet in thickness and consist of poorly consolidated coarse sands and gravels, silts, and clay units. The clay units in part reflect the existence of the sizable Tulare and Corcoran Lakes; both originated in Pleistocene times, and Tulare Lake survived until agricultural impacts over the last 100 years terminated its existence.

While no known paleontological sites exist within one-quarter mile of the HPP area, fossil mammal assemblages have been collected from the Tulare Lake–Corcoran area to the south and west. These locality data are included in the confidential Appendix L. Both Tulare Lake margin areas have produced large fossil mammal specimens, such as proboscidian (elephant), camel, sloth, and bison (buffalo).

Paleontological localities outside the one-quarter-mile radius of the HPP area, but within a 10-mile radius, contain scientifically important resources that represent a wide variety of terrestrial vertebrate taxa, including mammoth, giant ground sloth, camel, bison, horse, wolf, and rodent terrestrial mammalian taxa. The sandstone, silt, and clay lithologies of the geologic units are favorable for exceptional preservation of vertebrate and microvertebrate fossil resources. Three paleontological localities are present within a 10-mile radius of the HPP area; these data

are included in the confidential Appendix L. Stratigraphic occurrences of all localities have been assigned to the Pleistocene Quaternary alluvium (*Qal*) unit.

Earth-fill and cement materials as well as other existing industrial facilities infrastructure are expected to have either removed or obscured surface exposures of the older *Qal* sediments (or Tulare Lake deposit equivalents) in some areas. Occurrences of these stratigraphic units at near-surface depths are quite probable.

**Holocene and Post-Holocene-Age Sediments.** Sediments of probable Holocene or post-Holocene age that form the thin, surficial cover in the HPP area are considered to be of limited paleontological interest and thus considered inconsequential.

### 8.16.1.4 Method of Assessing Sensitivity

The assessment of paleontological sensitivity of the proposed HPP plant site and associated linear facilities is based both on known paleontological sites near the HPP area, as well as extrapolated biostratigraphic information derived from rock units in adjacent areas or areas of regional context. The sensitivity of each project component was determined through archival research into the distribution of known fossil localities, fossil-bearing geologic units, exposures of non-fossiliferous rocks, and surface outcrops of the different rock units.

Paleontological field surveys were conducted as appropriate. Survey results are provided in Section 8.16.1.6.

Geologic units (mappable rock formations) within a one-half-mile radius of the HPP area and their paleontological sensitivity are shown on Figure 8.16-3 and Tables 8.16-1 and 8.16-2 as geologic contacts and specific sensitivity ratings. Known paleontological sites within or near the HPP area are detailed in Appendix L.

Three categories of paleontological potential are used in this report, according to CEC standards. Rating categories are considered interpretive and are subject to change as new information is obtained. High potential, moderate potential, and low potential ratings are defined below.

**High Potential Rating.** Rock units with a high potential for significant paleontological resources are known to have yielded vertebrate fossils within the HPP area or region. Such a rating does not imply that additional vertebrate fossils will be recovered from this rock unit, but that previous occurrences have been recorded. Additional factors that are considered in making a determination pertain to inferred depositional environment and lithology.

**Moderate Potential Rating.** A moderate potential rating is applied to rock units that possess some degree of potential, such as a favorable depositional environment for resource preservation or characteristics of lithologically similar rock units in the region that have yielded vertebrate fossils. All rock units rated as having moderate potential are recommended for field survey and construction monitoring.

**Low Potential Rating.** A low potential rating is applied to rock units with lithologies that do not commonly preserve significant fossil resources, such as coarse boulder conglomerates or welded (ignimbrite) volcanic ash deposits. Igneous rocks, such as the granodiorite outcrops, do not preserve paleontological resources due to their genesis within a magmatic environment.

### 8.16 1.5 Field Survey Methods

Mr. David Lawler, project paleontologist, conducted a site visit on May 26–27, 2001. The proposed HPP components were subjected to a pedestrian survey in areas where open exposures afforded the possibility of observing undisturbed native substrate. The project paleontologist walked a systematic pattern of 50-foot-wide transects of the proposed plant site, inspecting soils and exposures such as agricultural plowed land, rodent burrow tailings, gullies, and drainages for evidence of fossiliferous materials. Each proposed linear facility was also subjected to a pedestrian survey to a distance of 200 feet on each side of the right-of-way centerline, with approximately 50 feet between transects. Where pavement or elements of the built environment precluded full coverage of the corridor, the survey corridor was narrowed to exposed surfaces. The investigation focused on discerning whether sensitive fossil materials were evident in native soils derived from the *Qal/Qu* (Quaternary alluvium) geologic unit. See Table 8.16-3 for field survey coverage by HPP component and field conditions.

### 8.16.1.6 Findings

The sensitivity ratings determined through archival research and field survey are shown in Tables 8.16-1 and 8.16-2. It should be noted that sensitivity ratings can change as new paleontological surveys are undertaken and add to the existing database. Identification of vertebrate or microvertebrate sites and materials of scientific significance can elevate a particular rock unit's paleontological rating. All of the project sites were determined to be underlain by Quaternary alluvium, which has moderate to high paleontological sensitivity.

**Plant Site.** There is minimal topographic relief at the proposed plant site. The undifferentiated Quaternary alluvial sediments (*Qal/Qu*) underlying the site are assigned a high sensitivity rating. Ground visibility is approximately 95 percent in the plant site area.

**Transmission Route.** The proposed transmission line segment is entirely within *Qal* and is assigned a high sensitivity rating. Ground visibility is approximately 95 percent in the transmission route area.

**Gas Pipeline Route.** The natural gas pipeline will be constructed entirely within the *Qal* unit and is assigned a high sensitivity rating. A maximum excavation depth of 6 feet for the majority of the proposed underground pipeline route is estimated. No fossil materials were observed during the field survey.

Ground visibility is approximately 95 percent from the proposed plant site south to the New Star Facility. At the New Star Facility, ground visibility is reduced to zero percent because of artificial fill/ground cover such as paving. Ground cover south of the New Star Facility is approximately 95 percent, with the exception of 25th Avenue, which is paved and therefore has zero visibility. South of the Avenal Cutoff, 25th Avenue changes from paving to dirt. On the west side of 25th Avenue, commercially grown barley obscures visibility to zero percent. On the east side of the 25th Avenue, south of the Avenal Cutoff, visibility is approximately 95 percent.



### 8.16.2 Environmental Consequences

Often, only monitoring during excavation can reveal the paleontological content of a formation at a specific impact location. However, for the purposes of this analysis, and in keeping with CEC guidance, the assumption is made that “if the rock units in the geologic formations which are to be disturbed have a high or moderate potential to contain fossil materials, these formations are considered likely to incur impacts” (CEC, 1992).

Excavation activities have the highest potential to unearth and affect paleontological resources. With implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in Section 8.16.3, no significant impacts on paleontological resources are anticipated. With proper mitigation, the HPP could result in recordation of new paleontological resources in the project region.

#### 8.16.2.1 Direct Impacts

**Plant Site.** The *Qal/Qu* formation underlying the proposed plant site is assigned a high sensitivity rating. Paleontological resources could be adversely affected by excavation activity.

**Transmission Route.** The proposed interconnecting transmission line is underlain by *Qal/Qu* sedimentary deposits of a high sensitivity rating. Paleontological resources could be adversely affected by excavation activity.

**Gas Pipeline Route.** The formation traversed by the proposed gas pipeline route is assigned a high sensitivity rating, where pipeline excavations are not within artificial fill or disturbed soil material. Paleontological resources could be adversely affected by excavation activity.

#### 8.16.2.2 Indirect Impacts

The construction, operation, and maintenance of the HPP are not expected to result in significant indirect impacts to paleontological resources. As noted above, paleontological resources typically derive their importance from the physical remains and/or association with geologic strata or other fossils, which would not be indirectly affected.

### 8.16.2.3 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on regional paleontological resources due to the proposed HPP are limited, because implementation of mitigation will reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. The HPP will not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the region. Scientifically controlled recovery at significant paleontological sites and/or site avoidance will ensure that the information content of such sites is retained.

### 8.16.3 Mitigation Measures

#### 8.16.3.1 General Measures

The literature review did not identify any known fossil localities that appear to be affected by the proposed HPP. The greatest potential for a discovery will occur during new ground-disturbing activities associated with construction. Based on the sensitivity of the underlying formations, the most prudent course involves paleontological monitoring during construction coupled with the following mitigation measures and monitoring recommendations:

- Prior to the start of construction, the HPP owner will provide the CEC with the name and qualifications of its designated paleontological resources specialist and mitigation team members. The paleontologist will be responsible for implementing the following measures and for using qualified personnel for these tasks.
- Prior to the start of HPP construction, the designated paleontological resource specialist will prepare a draft paleontological resource monitoring and mitigation plan to identify general and specific measures to minimize potential impacts to sensitive paleontological resources. Upon approval by the CEC Compliance Project Manager (CPM), the paleontological resource specialist will implement the plan.
- If a paleontological locality is discovered in a direct impact area, an attempt will be made to modify the facility design or placement to avoid the impact. Modifications could include minor rerouting of onsite subsurface utility alignments.
- If a significant paleontological locality is discovered near a direct impact area, the resource will be protected during the construction period through temporary or permanent measures, which may include construction period

covenants against vehicular traffic and excavation within the locality, and/or permanent or temporary fencing. Measures of this type will be incorporated in the mitigation and monitoring plan noted above, for review by the CEC prior to construction.

- Prior to construction, a paleontologist will meet with contractor personnel to provide them with information on the appearance of fossils, research values, and regulatory responsibilities. The crew will also be briefed on procedures to follow in the event that a potentially significant fossil locality or fossil find is uncovered during construction. The contractor briefing will be videotaped for the education of new personnel, as applicable.
- In the event that fossils are uncovered during construction, and a paleontologist is not on site, work in the vicinity will halt and a paleontologist will be called. The paleontologist will examine the find and assess its significance in accordance with the resource significance criteria discussed above (Section 8.16.2). If the resource is determined to be significant, impacts that cannot be avoided will be mitigated through data recovery or other means, in consultation with the CEC.
- A paleontologist will perform field inspections during initial ground-breaking, and then monitor excavation at facility locations in areas that have been confirmed through field inspection to have high or moderate sensitivity. If excavations bring paleontological materials to the surface, a paleontologist will collect samples for data recovery and analysis. In the event that a major significant find is uncovered, the emergency discovery procedures described above will also apply.
- The HPP owner will ensure preparation of a Paleontological Resources Report by the designated paleontological resources specialist if significant fossils are found and recovered during HPP activity.

### 8.16.3.2 Site-Specific Measures

**Plant Site.** Due to the high sensitivity rating of the formation underlying the proposed plant site, there is the potential for significant paleontological resources to occur below surface. Previously unidentified paleontological resources present on the plant site could be disturbed or destroyed during excavation activity. It is recommended that a paleontologist monitor the initial excavation activities and periodically inspect any deep excavation. Monitoring will be conducted in compliance with the monitoring and mitigation plan described above.

**Transmission Route.** Due to the high sensitivity rating of the formation underlying this proposed transmission route, there is a high potential for significant paleontological resources to occur below surface. Previously unidentified paleontological resources present along the route could be disturbed or destroyed during excavation activity. It is recommended that a paleontologist monitor initial excavation activities and periodically inspect any deep excavation. Monitoring will be conducted in compliance with the monitoring and mitigation plan described above.

**Gas Pipeline Route.** Due to the high sensitivity rating of the formation traversed by the proposed gas pipeline, there is potential for significant paleontological resources to occur below surface. Previously unidentified paleontological resources present along the proposed gas pipeline route could be disturbed or destroyed during excavation activity. It is recommended that a paleontologist monitor initial excavation activities and periodically inspect any deep excavation. Monitoring will be conducted in compliance with the monitoring and mitigation plan described above.

### **8.16.4 Proposed Conditions of Certification**

Proposed conditions of certification are contained in Appendix K. These conditions are proposed in order to ensure compliance with applicable LORS and/or to reduce potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

### **8.16.5 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards**

Implementation of the mitigation measures described above will result in HPP conformance with the applicable LORS. The applicable LORS for the evaluation and protection of paleontological resources are described below and summarized in Table 8.16-4.

#### **8.16.5.1 Federal Authorities and Administering Agencies**

**National Environmental Policy Act of 1968 (NEPA), as amended; United States Code (USC), Section 4321 4327; 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Section 1502.25:** NEPA requires analysis of potential environmental impacts to important historic,

cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage. Federal involvement has not been identified for this project.

### **1978 Memorandum from Acting Director of Bureau of Land Management:**

This memorandum provides significance criteria for paleontological resources. Federal involvement has not been identified for this project.

#### **8.16.5.2 State Authorities and Administering Agencies**

**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15064.5; California Public Resources Code, Sections 5024, 5024.5, and 21083.2; Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15126:** CEQA addresses the treatment of significant cultural resources (which under CEQA include fossils, paleontological localities, and formations with a high potential to contain unique fossils or paleontological deposits) that could be affected by the project. CEQA provides a framework for evaluating the significance of the resources, assessing project impacts to important resources, and developing a plan to avoid or address adverse effects to these resources. Formal findings of resource significance (for state purposes, eligibility to the California Register of Historic Resources) and assessment of project impacts are made by the lead state regulatory agency. The administering agency for this authority is the CEC.

**California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.5:** This section of the code makes it a misdemeanor to remove, without authorization, archaeological resources or paleontological remains from sites located on public lands. The administering agency for the this authority is the Kings County Planning Department.

#### **8.16.5.3 Local Authorities and Administering Agencies**

**Kings County General Plan:** The Kings County General Plan encourages identification and protection of cultural heritage resources including historic, prehistoric, architectural, and paleontological resources. Kings County supports the mitigation of damage to archaeological and paleontological resources after the Historical Commission has identified resources that warrant further recognition and preservation. The County protects and enhances cultural heritage resources through land use regulations, historic district zoning, registration in

the National Register, designation of County Historic Landmarks, and private or public acquisition. Kings County is the administering agency and follows all provisions of CEQA.

#### **8.16.5.4 Industry Codes and Standards**

No industry codes or standards are applicable to the HPP.

#### **8.16.5.5 Agencies and Agency Contacts**

The pertinent agency contact is provided below.

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Kings County Planning Department	Mr. Chuck Kinney	Planner	(559) 582-3211 ext. 2674

#### **8.16.5.6 Applicable Permits**

No permit requirements have been identified at the federal, state, or local level for this project.

#### **8.16.6 References**

Bartow, J.A. 1987. Cenozoic Stratigraphy of the Northern San Joaquin Valley, Central California, *In - Structural Geology of the Sacramento Basin, SEPM Geologic Guidebook Series*. 117 p.

Bartow, J.A. 1991. Cenozoic Evolution of the San Joaquin Valley, California *U. S. Geol. Surv. Professional Paper 1501*.

California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG). 1966. Fresno Sheet. Regional Geological Map Series, Scale 1:250,000.

Croft, M.G. 1967. Basic Data for Three Lacustrine Clay Deposits in the Southern Part of the San Joaquin Valley. *U. S. Geol. Surv. Open File Report*.

Croft, M.G. 1968. Geology, Hydrology, and Water Quality in the Hanford-Visalia Area, San Joaquin Valley, California. *U. S. Geol. Surv.- Water Resources Div., Open File Report*.

Croft, M.G. 1969. Subsurface geology of the Late Tertiary and Quaternary water-bearing deposits of the San Joaquin Valley, California. *U. S. Geol. Surv.- Water Resources Div., Open File Report*.

- Lawler, David. 2001. *Paleontological Resources –GWF Henrietta Peaker Project, Kings County, California.*
- Marchand, D.E. and Allwardt, A.O. 1981. Late Cenozoic Stratigraphic Units, Northeast San Joaquin Valley, California. *California U. S. Geol. Surv. Professional Paper 1470*, 70p.
- Miller, W.E. 1971. Pleistocene Vertebrates of the Los Angeles Basin and Vicinity (Exclusive of Rancho La Brea). *Los Angeles Co. Mus. Nat Hist. Sci. Bull.* Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 47-142.
- Savage, D.E. 1951. Late Cenozoic Vertebrates of the San Francisco Bay Region. *Univ. Calif. Public. Geol. Sci.*, Vol. 28, No. 10, pp.215-314, 51 figs.
- Stirton, R.A. 1939. Late Cenozoic Vertebrates of the San Francisco Bay Region. *Univ. Calif. Public. Geol. Sci.*, Vol. 24, pp.339-410, 95 figs.
- Stirton, R.A. 1951. Prehistoric Land Mammals of the San Francisco Bay Region. *In - Geologic Guidebook of the San Francisco Bay Counties, Calif. Div. Mines Geol., Regional Map Series, Bulletin 154*, pp.177-186.
- Wolf, R.G. 1971. Paleoecology of a Late Pleistocene (Rancholabrean) Vertebrate Fauna from Rodeo, California, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 136 p., unpublished.
- Wolf, R.G. 1973. Hydrodynamic Sorting and Ecology of Late Pleistocene Mammalian Assemblage from California (USA). *Paleogeog., Paleoclimatol., Paleoecol.*, Vol. 13, pp. 91-102.
- Wolf, R.G. 1975. Sampling and Sample Size in Ecological Analyses of Fossil Mammals, *Paleobiology*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 195-202.

**TABLES**



## 8.16 PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

**Table 8.16-1**  
**Geologic Units Within HPP Area**

Symbol	Rock Unit	Age	Sensitivity Rating
( <i>Qal/Qu</i> ) *	Alluvium	Pleistocene	High-Known vertebrate fauna

\* Usage of the *Qal* designation on available geologic maps of the Kings County region is highly variable. Geologic units ranging from Quaternary stream, terrace, fluvial, alluvial fan, and floodplain deposits, including older alluvium or Tulare Lake units, may be grouped under this designation, particularly where geologic data have been scarce due to agricultural or urban development.

**Table 8.16-2**  
**Paleontological Sensitivity and Geologic Units for the HPP**

Area	Rock Formation	Sensitivity Rating
<b>Plant Site</b>		
20 acres	<i>Qal/Qu</i>	High
<b>Transmission Route</b>		
550 feet	<i>Qal/Qu</i>	High
<b>Gas Pipeline Route</b>		
2.2 miles	<i>Qal/Qu</i>	High

**Table 8.16-3**  
**Survey Coverage by Project Component and Field Conditions**

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Field Conditions</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Plant Site (includes 16.5-foot water supply line)	95 percent ground visibility, area spans agricultural lands, which at the time of the survey had small cotton seedlings growing affording good ground visibility.	Pedestrian field inspection, good ground visibility.
Transmission Route	95 percent ground visibility, area spans a dirt farm road, a portion of the Henrietta Substation, and agricultural lands, which at the time of the survey supported growth of small cotton seedlings, affording good ground visibility.	Pedestrian field inspection, good ground visibility.
Natural Gas Pipeline Route	0–95 percent ground visibility, area spans a paved road, agricultural lands and a wide dirt road. Within the paved portion of 25th Avenue and in the agricultural field south of the Avenal Cutoff and west of 25th Avenue (where dense barley was growing at the time of the survey) there was zero ground visibility. The New Star facility area was not inspected.	Pedestrian field inspection, good ground visibility, except along the paved road and in one agricultural parcel with dense barley growth.

**Table 8.16-4**  
**LORS Applicable to Paleontological Resources**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Authority</b>	<b>Requirements/Compliance</b>	<b>Administering Agency</b>	<b>AFC Compliance Section</b>
Federal †	NEPA; 42 USC 4321–4327; 40 CFR § 1502.25.	Analysis of potential environmental impacts on federal lands.	Lead federal agency †	Section 8.16-13
†	1978 Memorandum from the Bureau of Land Management	Implements significance criteria for paleontological resources.	Lead federal agency †	Section: 8.16-13
State	CEQA § 15064.5; California Public Resources Code §§ 5024, 5024.5, and 21083.2; Title 14, CCR § 15126.4	Formal findings by the project lead agency regarding project-related effects to important paleontological resources.	CEC	Sections: 8.16-2, 8.16-9, 8.16-13, 8.16-14
	California Public Resources Code § 5097.5	This code section makes it a misdemeanor to remove, without authorization, paleontological remains fromes located on public lands.	Kings County Planning Department	Section: 8.16-14
Local	Kings County Planning Department	The county follows all provisions of CEQA.	Kings County Planning Department	Section: 8.16-14
Industry	None applicable.	--	--	Section: 8.16-14

† This project is not a federal undertaking at this time and is not expected to trigger any of the federal LORS described herein.

### FIGURES